UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,918	07/05/2005	Todd Stout	67101-002	2982
	7590 06/01/201 ASKEY & OLDS, P.C.	EXAMINER		
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD			ASTORINO, MICHAEL C	
SUITE 350 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3769	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/524,918	STOUT, TODD
Exammer-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael C. Astorino	3769
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Per</u> <u>Action</u>	nding, before Final Office
(1) <u>Michael C. Astorino</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Karin Butchko</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10 March 2010	Time: <u>1:00</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Prior art rejection under Epler et al. US Patent Number 7,024,3	70	
Claims discussed: Pending claims 18, 47-89, and 91.		
Prior art documents discussed: Epler et al. US Patent Number 7,024,370		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Michael C. Astorino/		
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3769	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted the Applicant's representative to discuss Epler et al. The Examiner identified and explained Epler et al. in detail. The participants discussed reasonability of interpretations of Epler et al. and distinguishing characteristics between Epler et al. and the present application. Proposals to overcome Epler et al. included swearing behind the reference or adding additional limitations into the claims. However, the Applicant disagreed with the reasonability of the examiner's interpretation of Epler et al.'s disclosure. The Examiner discussed the possibility of later discussing the reference and the claims after the office action was mailed out. Additionally the examiner mentioned the benefit of having the inventors in the present application review the references and identify distinguishing characteristics between the reference and the applicant's invention.